



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/813,839	03/31/2004	Hugh B. Svendsen	1104-062	6056
74548	7590	06/02/2008	EXAMINER	
FlashPoint Technology and Withrow & Terranova 100 Regency Forest Drive Suite 160 Cary, NC 27518			KIM, JUNG W	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2132		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/02/2008	PAPER	

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Continuation Sheet**

Applicant's arguments with respect to the prior art rejections have been considered but is not persuasive. The primary thrust of applicant's argument is grounded on the allegation that the packet described by Sit does not anticipate the claimed limitation of a "request packet" because the rejection ignores "the feature of a request packet recited in the claims." (Remarks, pg. 4) In response to applicant's argument, the following thought question must be asked: what is the feature of a request packet as recited in the claims? As recited in exemplary claim 1, a request packet is one that is translated from an HTTP request and then submitted to a peer server; whereupon the peer server translates it back to the HTTP request, thereby enabling generic web traffic to flow. (see steps c and d of claim 1) In order for the prior art to meet the limitation of a "request packet," it must suggest these steps in the method claim. Accordingly, in product claims defined as a product by process (see for example, claim 17), the prior art must also suggest these steps performed by the product. As enumerated in the final action mailed on 3/14/08, and contrary to applicant's allegations, the packet disclosed by Sit perform these exact steps. If applicant has a different meaning for a "request packet," this meaning must be specifically defined in the Specification, or recited as additional limitations in the claims. Because the Specification does not provide a definition of a request packet, and the claim does not describe any additional structural features of a request packet, except for its use within a method and product, the transformed packet

of Sit that is used to transfer messages across a firewall suggest applicant's claimed request packet.